



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRAVELS OF FOUR YEARS AND A HALF IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DURING 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801 AND 1802. By John Davis. With an introduction and notes by A. J. Morrison. New York Henry Holt & Co., 1909; pp. 429.

It was a happy thought to reprint this very interesting old book of travels, and its original value is enhanced by Mr. Morrison's introduction and notes.

John Davis was one of the most observant of our early visitors, and his comments on men and things are very well worth reading. His accounts of his life in South Carolina, in Washington, Philadelphia and in Virginia are of especial interest. He visited Alexandria, Occoquan, Colchester and other places in that section, heard Parson Weems preach at Pohick, and taught school in Prince William county for several months.

PATRICIAN AND PLEBEIAN IN VIRGINIA or the Origin and Development of Social Classes in the Old Dominion. By Thomas J. Wertenbaker, M. A. A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the University of Virginia as a Part of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Published by the Author. The Michie Company, Printers, Charlottesville, Va., 1910.

If the subjects given in the title above were suggested to older students of Virginia history, their comment would be that the information any one now has or can obtain in regard to the origin of social classes in Virginia is entirely too small to authorize a positive statement or any general rule, and that a proper study of their development would require the profound knowledge of all of our records such as a Bruce possesses. In addition to this, moreover, a writer on the social history of Virginia should be deeply read in the similar history of England.

Mr. Wertenbaker cannot possess the first class of information, and has made it evident that he has but a superficial acquaintance with the second, and hardly as much knowledge of the last.

It may be asked why, then, is it necessary to treat his book at such length? It is because the subjects of which he treats are of such importance that it is very desirable that Mr. Wertenbaker's readers should not be misled.

He tells us that Virginia of the seventeenth century contained a population composed, in the main, of indentured servants and humble and ignorant yeomen; but with a ruling class principally descendants of merchants—merchants being a set of people, says the author, well known for their lack of any high sense of honor, for their timidity (not

to say cowardice), and for not having any great consideration for women. Such a community, naturally, is noted for its sharp dealings and for prevalence of fraud and dishonesty among all classes. A gloomy prospect for the future. Notwithstanding all these evils, the effect of Virginia environment is so strong that in a few generations these most unpromising people develop into one of the most high-minded, courageous and chivalrous races on earth.

This summary seems, perhaps, extravagant; but it is, essentially, the argument of the book.

In the first division of his work, the origin of social classes, the author is discussing a subject of which neither he nor any one else knows enough to enable them to write anything worth reading. The latter part of the book, treating of the growth of wealth and cultivation in the Colony, and of the middle and lower classes of inhabitants, though some exceptions may be taken, is much better.

The author, plainly, is not clear as to his own definition of "aristocracy" and "middle classes." In the preface "aristocracy" seems to mean persons of noble birth, yet in writing of the "gentlemen," who came in such crowds in the earliest ships, he evidently includes them among the "aristocracy." Now there is no reason to believe that the "gentlemen" who came in 1607, 1608, &c., were any more aristocrats than the numerous "gentlemen" who came later. If, by the "middle class" referred to in the preface, the author means every one below the rank of a peer and above that of a yeoman, including baronets, gentlemen, merchants and professional men, he is probably right in thinking that such a "middle class" composed the bulk of the ruling class of Virginia. But a definition like this is plainly what he does not mean.

It is known that few members of noble families came to any of the colonies. Farther than that our information about the social status of the emigrants to Virginia is so exceedingly scanty that it is impossible for any general statement to be made. The majority of these emigrants may have been merchants (and, of course, many were), or gentlemen or yeomen, or what not. Simply we do not know.

This review of Mr. Wertenbaker's book is not an argument in behalf of any theory or any class. It is only an effort to show that he does not know and could not know what he says he knows.

On page 9 it is said that in 1624, when James I took away the Company's charter, there were few others in the Colony than indentured servants and people of humble origin and means. Probably the author does not know of the existence of "The List of the Living and Dead in Virginia, February 16, 1623," published in a Virginia Senate Document in 1874, and in Hotten's *Emigrants*, or of the census of 1624-5, also contained in the latter work. At least neither of these very essential publications is included in the "best Virginia bibliography ever prepared," which is added as an appendix to Mr. Wertenbaker's book.

If he will take these lists and go over them carefully he will see how few names there are of whom anything is known. But there are some persons whose origin is certain, and who were of no very humble social rank. There were Thomas Paulett, grandson of a Marquis of Winchester; Nathaniel and John West, sons of Lord Delaware; Hawte Wyatt, a member of one of the most distinguished families of English gentry; Edward Berkeley, son of John Berkeley, of Beverstone Castle; Henry Southey, "Esq.," formerly of Rimpton, in Somerset; Dr. John Pott, an Oxford M. A.; Richard Kingsmill, whose daughter's tomb still bears the arms of his family; Adam Thoroughgood, a boy of eighteen, who was ranked among the servants of Mr. Edward Waters, but who was plainly no menial, as he had two brothers who were knights, one of them in the household of the Duke of Buckingham, and not many years later received a grant of 5,200 acres by special order of "their Lordships and others of His Majesty's Privie Council"; Sir George Yeardley, the son of a London merchant tailor, and also a member of the Virginia Company, an officer in the Low Countries, and long one of the leading men of Virginia; Captain Roger Smith, who had also been a Low Country officer; Maurice Thompson, a rich merchant (father of the first Lord Haversham), and his brothers George, Paul and William Thompson; Ralph Hamor, who had been Secretary of Virginia as far back as 1611, and had written a well-known account of the Colony; William Farrar, a kinsman of the noted members of the Company; John Procter, brother of a London merchant and ship-owner; Daniel Gookin and William Claiborne, gentlemen of known descent; Charles Harmer, brother of John Harmer, Greek professor at Oxford; Abraham Piercy, who had been for a number of years the wealthiest man in the Colony; Christopher Branch and Thomas Baugh, whose ancestry has been recently traced, and, among others, Farrar Flinton, Giles Allington, William Tucker, John Bush, Albino Lupo, Thomas Spilman, Peter Arundel, John Cheesman, Robert Poole, John Southerne, Thomas Willoughby, William Perry, Robert Sweete, Thomas Flint, Edward Waters, Raleigh Crashaw and Thomas Harwood, all styled "gentlemen" in contemporary records. It is true nothing is known of their ancestry, but exactly the same is the case with most of the "gentlemen" who came in the early emigration, and there is just as good reason to assign aristocracy to one as to the other.

These examples show how incorrect is the author's statement in regard to the population in 1623-25; but, at the same time, it must be repeated that we know nothing of the great majority of the names in the lists referred to.

The remark on page 10 about dissipated and spendthrift gentlemen still coming to Virginia, and the note on page 32 about the corrupt and unscrupulous nobility, belong properly, as Fiske once said about similar utterances, to the Elijah Pogram period of America history. Captain

Stone, by the way, selected by the author as a type of the dissipated gentleman, really belonged to his favorite merchant class, [as he was brother of a London mercer. Whatever may have been the truth in De Vries' statement; Stone lived to be a governor of Maryland.

An assertion (p. 11) which would not have been made by any one who had made a real study of the subject and who knew how little information exists in regard to the social antecedents and personal rank of our early settlers, is boldly made by the author of this book: "How few men of good social standing there were in the colony at this period [the first half of the seventeenth century] is shown by the number of important positions filled by men of humble origin and rank. The evidence is conclusive that on many occasions indentured servants who had served their term of bondage and had acquired property, were elected by the people to represent them in the House of Burgesses."

With a few exceptions, which will be noted, this statement is absolutely and completely without evidence to support it.

Of the members of the Council between 1607 and 1650, only two names can be found who had ever been, even technically, on the list of servants. Adam Thoroughgood who has been already referred to, and who was certainly never, even as a boy, any real servant; and Richard Townshend who, as appears from his own petition, was apprenticed to Dr. Pott to learn the profession of physic and surgery, a common method long after that time.

While referring to the Council it may be well to state that there were during the seventeenth century 172 members of that body, of these the origin of 85 are totally unknown, 66 were of gentle affiliations, 19 were of the merchant class, and 2 yeomen.

Of the House of Burgesses of March, 1623-4, a period picked out by the author as one especially marked by the humble social rank of the population of Virginia, not a single member had been a servant. At the session of October, 1629, there were 46 members. Of these William Allen, William Poppleton, Richard Townshend and Lionel Rowleston, had been included in lists of "servants." Townshend has already been referred to. Nothing is known of the origin of Lionel Rowleston except about this time he is styled "gentleman" and that there was an old North-of-England family of Rowlestons, in which Lionel several times appeared as a Christian name. At the session of March, 1629-30, of 45 members, there were two whose names had appeared in the lists of servants. Space will not admit, even if it were necessary, the following up of this subject session by session. Still a few other tests may be made, taking instances at random. At the session of February, 1644-5, only one man who had been a servant appears; in October, 1646, there were 25 members, not one of whom had been a servant, and in October, 1649, 25 members, two of whom had been servants. These instances are sufficient to show the utter fallacy of Mr. Wertenbaker's view and the statement from "Virginia's Cure" is proven to be false.

It may be worth while to repeat an estimate which has already been made in this Magazine. In a published list (necessarily incomplete) of the members of the House of Burgesses, 1274 appear before the year 1700. Very many of these are duplicates, but that does not effect this calculation. The English ancestry of only about ten per cent. of these Burgesses is known. Eight per cent. of the Burgesses are known to be of gentle birth. The unknown ninety per cent. may have had almost any imaginable descent, but how can any one claiming to write history make positive general statements when the unknown quantity is so large.

It seems to be Mr. Wertenbaker's rule to say that every man of whose superior rank he is not fully informed, is of humble birth. It can be only on some such ground that he makes this statement in regard to men like Samuel Mathews, William Pierce and others. Those who have made a long study of our early settlers have been able, so far, to discover nothing about the origin of these men, and only know that they became people of property and standing soon after they appeared in Virginia.

Abraham Piersey, John Chew and George Menefie did hold high positions in Virginia, but no higher than they would have held in England with fortunes proportionate to English wealth. The great merchant was always in England a man of influence.

There were, of course, a number of very prominent and influential families in Virginia descended from merchants. The Byrds, Ludwells, Blands, Bollings and Tayloes are examples. The English merchant was, as a rule, close to the land. He was either a descendant of a gentle or yeoman family in the country, or hoped, if fortunate, to invest in land and found a family. The Byrds, Blands and Bollings were descended from younger sons of Cheshire and Yorkshire gentlemen. While the father of the two distinguished Ludwells, Thomas and Philip, was a Bruton mercer, their mother was a Cottington, the daughter of a country gentleman. Neither of the brothers was in any way connected with trade while in Virginia, and it seems probable that they owed their influential position to their uncle, Lord Cottington's friends at Court. Mr. Wertenbaker's mention of the Fitzhughs in this connection reminds one that he sometimes does not know the names of the people he is writing about nor how to spell them. For instance, he refers to Thomas instead of William Fitzhugh; spells Skipwith "Skipworth," and Chichley "Cheskeley," and on page 86 substitutes several times "Ludlow" for the correct "Ludwell."

On page 20 and those immediately succeeding Mr. Wertenbaker, as part of his argument that but few cavaliers came to Virginia, denies that the increase of population from 15,000 in 1649 to 38,000 in 1671, was due to such emigration, but can be accounted for by the importation of servants at the rate of from 1,000 to 1,200 a year, and additions by births among free residents. This is another branch of his work where,

in the absence of any definite information, he jumps at conclusions drawn from his own conjectures. No one can say positively what caused the increase. There were, of course, many servants imported and many children born, but we have no figures for the increase in either way, and no statements as to what sort of people composed the immigrations during the period. Neither the author or any other investigator has yet gone through the Land Grants and ascertained how many free men and how many servants are named in this class of records. Nor have the county records been examined for names not appearing in the grants.

In discussing the matter it should be clearly understood that "Cavalier" does not mean, in this connection, a class in society, but a political party. Any one acquainted with the history of England during the civil wars will feel that, after the defeat of the King, it was very reasonable to believe that many of his adherents should wish to leave the country. There can be no doubt that the belief which has been so long held that many of the Royalist party came to Virginia, is well grounded. No man could have been in better position to be informed than Clarendon. In the 18th book of his great history, writing of the surrender of Virginia to the Parliament, he says: "Sir William Berkeley, the Governor thereof, who had industriously invited many gentlemen and others thither as a place of security, * * * and where they might live plentifully, many persons of condition and good officers in the war had transplanted themselves with all the estates they had been able to preserve."

On page 23 is given a list of nearly "all cavaliers of any note" who came to Virginia. Though this list can be considerably added to, making lists of this sort will show very little in regard to Cavalier emigration, compared with the result of such thorough investigation of the Virginia records as has just been referred to, accompanied by a similar investigation of the Royalist Composition Papers in England.

Returning to the subject of the increase of population, we may take such figures as exist. In 1628 there were estimated to be 3,000 people in Virginia, of whom 500 were "freemen heads of families" (Virginia Magazine, III, 262); making a low estimate for these families, there would remain about 1,500 servants in Virginia at that time. If we next take an estimate, made from the land grants and printed in this Magazine, VIII, 441, 442, making deduction for the period between 1623 and 1628, we have 432 free people and 1,428 servants and slaves to be added, giving a probable population of 1,932 free people and 2,928 servants and slaves in 1637, or 4,860 in all. As the population in 1634 was estimated at 5,119, it is likely that the difference is to be accounted for by loss of land grants, and by persons (of whom there were many) who resided in Virginia but whose names do not appear in the grants.

In 1671 Berkeley said there were about 40,000 people in Virginia, of whom 6,000 were servants. If servants in 1671 composed 15% of the

population and in 1637, 60%, it is evident that the number of servants imported continually decreased and that of free emigrants increased.

The author next complacently states that he has proved that the majority of the ruling families of Virginia were of mercantile descent, and quotes this Magazine (I, 215, 217), as sustaining him. It is still believed that the view expressed in the Magazine is substantially correct, but it is certainly not in accord with that of the author of this book. With the peers and the great county families which equalled them in wealth and influence to a very great extent unrepresented, it is believed that the population of Virginia in the seventeenth century contained about the same proportion of families of gentle birth and of those descended from merchants and yeomen, that England did.

We may take some instances of well-known families represented in Council. Those of Claiborne, Kemp, Thoroughgood, Wormeley, Bernard, Wyatt, Ludlow, Digges, Bacon, Horsmanden, Reade, Corbin, Moryson, Jennings, Spencer, Page, Scarborough, Lightfoot, Robinson, Johnson, Burwell, Randolph, Fairfax and West were of gentle origin. Brewer, Bennett, Yeardley, Stagg, Tayloe, Ludwell, Bland, Cary, Byrd, Allerton, Custis and Nelson were of mercantile descent, though a number of these, going still farther back, trace to the county gentry.

Of the English ancestry of such names as Carter, Thornton, Grymes, Beverley, Lewis, Lee, Bray, Harrison, Berkeley, Smith, Duke, Parke, Whiting, Armistead, Hill, Lear, Warner, Leigh, Cole, Bridger, Pate, Beale, Swann and Willis we know nothing.

To use another kind of evidence. Take 239 families throughout the older Virginia counties (of course, not all of them of the great land-holding class, but all people of good social standing, composing a large part, though not all, of those who helped to make the upper classes), we find that of this number the origin of 115 is unknown (though 45, at least, of these used arms) and 114 of known origin. Of these families of known origin 58 were descended from gentlemen in England and Scotland, 26 descended from merchants, 17 from ministers and other professional men, two from masters of merchant ships, two from yeomen, one from the brother and legatee of a bishop, one from a French army officer, and one from a man of yeoman birth who was an Oxford A. B.

It will be seen from these figures how idle it is for any one with the information we have at present to make positive statements or advance theories in regard to the origin of social classes in Virginia, or to claim that a majority of the ruling class was derived from merchants (or indeed from any one class in England). Common sense is greatly needed in treating such subjects. Except during civil war Englishmen settled abroad then, as they do now, to better their condition. There was, as regards the colonies at least, no nonsense about "trade" and "society." No matter who the emigrant was, or what his origin, if he found he could make more money by having a store and trading as a

merchant than he could by planting alone, he traded. It required no mercantile ancestry to make a man do what was most profitable. English gentlemen, merchants and yeomen did it then in Virginia, and they are doing it now by thousands all over the world. The charge that the Virginians were sharp, tricky dealers is reinforced by a statement of the Dutch trader, De Vries. The Virginians might have said that this was the pot calling the kettle black, for the Dutch were the shrewdest traders in the world, and even sold goods to nations with whom they were at war.

On page 60 is said: "These English traders that made their home in the Colony became at once leaders, politically and socially," and quotes as an example the expulsion of Governor Harvey. Including all who were in any way the leaders of this movement, we find Mr. Wertenbaker's typical English traders to include Sir John Zouch, formerly of Codnor Castle, John West, William Farrar, William Claiborne, John Utie, Samuel Matthews, Dr. John Pott, Francis Pott, Nicholas Martian, William English, Thomas Harwood and George Menifie, who was really the only trader in the whole party.

We must pass over the meaningless talk of the House of Burgesses "representing the common people," and the "rapid change of front" by which the ruling classes retained their control, and proceed to one of the most curious parts of Mr. Wertenbaker's book. This is certainly the first time that the character of the Virginia people has been compared, not with England of that or the preceding age, or with the other colonies, but with the age of chivalry. The Virginia people did not have the chivalry of the mediæval knights, nor like them feel a joy for battle. Of course not! Neither did they talk Norman nor sleep in straw without any clothes. Such comparison is really hardly worth answering. Certainly, since the Knights of the Middle Ages no Anglo-Saxon—a few soldiers and adventurers excepted—has ever, unless he was drunk or insane, felt a joy for battle. When he has a good cause he fights, it is needless to say very well, but he does not fight for the love of it.

Equally surprising is the statement that, as a rule, the merchant had no high sense of honor, is timid, and has but little consideration for women. Were it not for the high sense of honor prevalent among the mercantile class the business of the world would stop in a day—indeed, business on any but the smallest scale would never have begun.

Merchants and tradesmen were brought up in the ways of peace; but they, like other Englishmen, could fight when the time came.

Several times during the great civil war the London train bands, composed of merchants, tradesmen and mechanics, distinguished themselves by their stubbornness and gallantry in action. As for the broad-minded liberality of the London merchants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, let Mr. Wertenbaker study any collection containing their wills. That of Mr. Waters has enough to serve all purposes.

These unenviable traits of character which the author ascribes to merchants, he states they handed on to Seventeenth Century Virginia. There is no more evidence that such traits existed in Virginia than that they were characteristic of a mercantile class.

There is not the slightest evidence to show that Virginia women of the time were not held in as high esteem by their fathers and husbands as were the women of England. All the remaining records give evidence to the contrary. The letters of William Fitzhugh and William Byrd are full of expressions of tenderness to wife, daughter, mother and sister, and of politeness to ladies of other families. The wills of the period show the same consideration.

There is no space for a detailed examination of the charges against the courage of the Virginians of the seventeenth century and of the poor quality of the militia.

There were only a few occasions when the militia was called out prior to the French and Indian War, but the service was in each case as satisfactory as a militia is apt to be. Had Mr. Wertenbaker been a reader of Dryden he would have remembered that the poet said that the chief object of militia-muster in England in his day, was to get drunk.

In the beginning of the French and Indian War the Virginia Legislature was, no doubt, very unwisely economical, but before the end of the war appropriated the great sum (for that day) of \$750,000.

To show the great change in Virginia character from the cowardice of the upper classes in the seventeenth century to what it had become at the time of the American Revolution, we are told how the upper classes were so much improved that aristocrats like Lee and Morgan held high command in the army. Daniel Morgan was one of nature's aristocrats, but certainly not of the kind this book so frequently refers to.

Another of the author's charges, that fraud and corruption were rife in private and public affairs in Virginia at the period he writes of, is, as he makes it, totally without foundation on any evidence to be found in the records. There were, of course, the isolated cases he gives; and more can be found, referring both to public officers and private citizens. But there is no more reason for saying that fraud and corruption are rampant in Virginia now than to make the same statement in regard to the seventeenth century.

There can be no doubt that many abuses grew up between 1660 and 1676, but there has never yet been a sufficiently thorough study of the period to determine how far the people's complaints were founded on real and unnecessary grievances, or whether they were parts of that unreasonable clamor against government which has been heard in every age when a country is passing through a season of hard times.

The founding of towns was ordered from England, the forts were considered necessary for defence against the Indians, and the buying of Arlington and Culpeper's claims to Virginia was a matter of vital im-

portance to the Colony, yet all of these things required that a poor people should be heavily taxed.

Another charge especially referred to by Mr. Wertenbaker was that Berkeley had put new men into office. As there was hardly a family which had been fifty years in Virginia, and most of the citizens were not natives, this has rather a queer air. As it happens, with the exception of one or two men, all the high officials and councillors who could have been appointed by the Governor were men who had been some time in Virginia.

Mr. Wertenbaker is a distinguished graduate of the University of Virginia and is devotedly attached to his State, and it is hardly necessary to say that he is thoroughly sincere in his belief in the views of Virginia history set forth in his book.

"OF SCEPTRED RACE." By Annah Robinson Watson, author of "Some Notable Families of America," [&c, &c.] Early Printing and Publishing Company, Memphis, Tenn., pp. 385, with 31 illustrations, portraits, views and coat of arms.

Mrs. Watson, who has already done creditable genealogical work, returns to the interesting field of royal descents with a new book bearing the title, "Of Sceptred Race." The volume is large, handsomely bound, printed and illustrated, and has a good index.

Royal descents, to the man-on-the-street, unacquainted with genealogical investigations, seem a huge joke. It appears an absurdity to say that the plain, every-day citizens he meets can have kings for ancestors. But it is perfectly true. A great number of them have such ancestry. The only trouble is to prove it.

A recent English writer on the subject says: "Probably most [English] families that possess a pedigree of seven or eight generations in the paternal line have at least one descent from the kings of England—perhaps many lines of descent." The probability is just as great in American families of English descent. That noted genealogical quarterly, "The Ancestor," said that Tennyson, though he told in verse how the grand old gardener and his wife laugh at the claims of long descent, was much pleased when some one found a "royal descent" for him, not knowing, remarked the somewhat synical *Ancestor*, that it was a possession most middle-class Englishmen had a right to claim.

That these royal descents are possible is due to the fact that during the reigns of the Plantaganet kings, princes and princesses of the blood royal frequently intermarried with English nobles and knights, and the descendants of these intermarried with the gentry. In the vicissitudes caused by time many families having royal blood in their veins fell into poverty, so that instances of such descent can now be found in every rank of life.

The English writer, just referred to, says that he knows a cab-driver who inherits the blood of Edward I, and that he (a clergyman) has re-